UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,689	04/06/2006	Etienne Annic	102114.00032	9764

54975 7590 09/20/2010

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
10 ST. JAMES AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02116-3889

EXAMINER	
KRAFT, SHIH-WEI	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/20/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,689	ANNIC, ETIENNE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHIH-WEI KRAFT	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 June 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 June 2010* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application.
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 6/30/2010 having Application No. 10/541,689.

2. Claims 1-2 and 4-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims. In Amendment, claim 3 was cancelled and no claims were added. This Office Action is made final.

Examiner Notes

3. Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 14 is objected to because of the limitations "the eXtended HyperText Markup Language" and "the Cascading Style Sheet language" in lines 2-4. There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alleshouse (US 6,540,142) (hereinafter Alleshouse) in view of Salter et al. (US 7,496,838) (hereinafter Salter).

As per claim 1, Alleshouse discloses a method of managing a peripheral comprising:

wherein an addressing indicating a location of the presentation description data (e.g. "stylesheet" or "schema document", col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34) of said content description data (e.g. "XML input data stream", col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34) is included within the content description data; (see col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

transmitting the content description data written by means of a content description language to the peripheral; (e.g., "data stream", see col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

interpreting the content description data in the peripheral by means of an interpretation software hosted within the peripheral, (e.g., "XSLT processor", see col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34) wherein the interpretation software uses the addressing to retrieve the presentation description data and uses the retrieved presentation data to interpret the content description data; and (see col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

translating the interpreted data into data for controlling the peripheral by means of a driver hosted within the peripheral (see Figure 2; see col. 4, lines 13-28; col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

but fails to disclose expressly writing data by means of a content description language, wherein the data is separated into content description data and presentation description data.

However, Salter discloses writing data by means of a content description language, (e.g., "HTML", see abstract; see col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 15-25) wherein the data is separated into content description data (e.g., "XML file", see abstract; see col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 15-25) and presentation description data, (e.g., "XSL file", see abstract; see col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine an XML printer system as described by Alleshouse with the separation of formatting and content data from an HTML file as taught by Salter because it would provide for the purpose of allowing content creators to continue to use their skills and tools which are directed towards HTML (see Salter col. 3, lines 11-15).

As per claim 2, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the method of managing a peripheral as claimed in claim 1, [see rejection to claim 1 above] wherein a result of the processing of the data by the interpretation software is stored in a means of storage of the peripheral (see Alleshouse col. 7, lines 48-58).

As per claim 4, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the method of managing a peripheral as claimed in claim 1, [see rejection to claim 1 above] but Alleshouse fails to disclose

expressly wherein the data written by means of the content description language are hosted in a server and in that the presentation description data are stored in said server identified by the addressing.

However, Salter discloses wherein the data written by means of the content description language are hosted in a server and in that the presentation description data are stored in said server identified by the addressing (see col. 12, lines 18-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine an XML printer system as described by Alleshouse with the separation of formatting and content data as taught by Salter because it would provide for the purpose of allowing a quicker response to clients receiving an XML input (see Salter col. 3, lines 16-39).

As per claim 7, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the method of managing a peripheral as claimed in claim 1, [see rejection to claim 1 above] but Alleshouse fails to disclose expressly wherein the content description language is a hypertext markup language.

However, Salter discloses wherein the content description language is a hypertext markup language (e.g., "HTML", see abstract; see col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine an XML printer system as described by Alleshouse with the separation of formatting and content data from an HTML file as taught by Salter because it would provide for the purpose of allowing content creators to continue to use their skills and tools which are directed towards HTML (see Salter col. 3, lines 11-15).

As per claim 9, Alleshouse discloses acomputer system comprising

at least one computer and a printer which are connected in a network, (see Figure 1; see col. 2, line 60 - col. 3, line 10; col. 3, lines 18-30, 46-65)

wherein the computer comprises means for transmitting data to the printer, (e.g., "data stream", see col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

wherein the data includes content description data (e.g. "XML input data stream", col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34) comprising an addressing indicating a location of a presentation description file, and (e.g. "stylesheet" or "schema document", col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

wherein the printer comprises an interpretation software (e.g., "XSLT processor", see col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34) which comprises means for retrieving the presentation description file on the server on the basis of said addressing and uses said retrieved presentation description file for interpreting the data transmitted and (see col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

a printer driver for translating the interpreted data into the form of printing control data (see Figure 2; see col. 4, lines 13-28; col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34)

but fails to disclose expressly a server, a presentation description file stored in the server.

However, Salter discloses a server, (see col. 12, lines 18-38) a presentation description file stored in the server (see abstract; see col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine an XML printer system as described by Alleshouse with the separation of formatting and content data as taught by Salter because it would provide for the purpose of allowing a quicker response to clients receiving an XML input (see Salter col. 3, lines 16-39).

As per claim 10, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 9, [see rejection to claim 9 above] wherein the content description data comprise a name of the presentation description file corresponding to the content description data (see Alleshouse col. 4, lines 13-28; col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34) but Alleshouse fails to disclose expressly wherein the server hosts the data written in a content description language.

However, Salter discloses wherein the server hosts the data written in a content description language (see col. 12, lines 18-38; col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine an XML printer system as described by Alleshouse with the separation of formatting and content data as taught by Salter because it would provide for the purpose of allowing a quicker response to clients receiving an XML input (see Salter col. 3, lines 16-39).

7. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alleshouse (US 6,540,142) (hereinafter Alleshouse) in view of Salter et al. (US 7,496,838) (hereinafter Salter) as applied to claims 4 and 10 above, and further in view of Berkema et al. (US 2003/0002072) (hereinafter Berkema).

As per claim 5, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the method of managing a peripheral as claimed in claim 4, [see rejection to claim 4 above] but Alleshouse and Salter fail to disclose expressly wherein the presentation description data are transmitted to the peripheral as a function of characteristics of said peripheral.

However, Berkema discloses wherein the presentation description data are transmitted to the peripheral as a function of characteristics of said peripheral (see ¶10, ¶32-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Alleshouse and Salter by combining the stylesheet or schema document with information regarding capabilities of a printer device as taught by Berkeman because it would provide for the purpose of formatting data for printing (see Berkeman ¶32-34).

As per claim 11, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 10, [see rejection to claim 10 above] but Alleshouse and Salter fail to disclose expressly wherein the printer comprises means for communicating identifying characteristics of said printer to the server, and in that the server comprises means for processing the characteristics of the printer so as to transmit thereto a version of the presentation description file corresponding to the characteristics of the printer.

However, Berkema discloses wherein the printer comprises means for communicating identifying characteristics of said printer to the server, and in that the server comprises means for processing the characteristics of the printer so as to transmit thereto a version of the presentation description file corresponding to the characteristics of the printer (see ¶10, ¶32-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Alleshouse and Salter by combining the stylesheet or schema document with information regarding capabilities of a printer device as taught by

Berkeman because it would provide for the purpose of formatting data for printing (see Berkeman ¶32-34).

8. Claims 6 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alleshouse (US 6,540,142) (hereinafter Alleshouse) in view of Salter et al. (US 7,496,838) (hereinafter Salter) in view of Berkema et al. (US 2003/0002072) (hereinafter Berkema) as applied to claims 5 and 11 above, and further in view of Knauft et al. (US 6,6654,754) (hereinafter Knauft).

As per claim 6, Alleshouse in view of Salter in view of Berkeman discloses the method of managing a peripheral as claimed in claim 5, [see rejection to claim 5 above] wherein the characteristics of the peripheral are conveyed (see Berkeman ¶10, ¶32-34) but Alleshouse, Salter and Berkeman fail to disclose expressly by a header of a message of a communication protocol used to convey the data.

However, Knauft discloses by a header of a message of a communication protocol used to convey the data (see col. 7, lines 33-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Alleshouse, Salter, and Berkeman by combining the information regarding capabilities of a printer device with the HTTP header as taught by Knauft because it would provide for the purpose of defining how messages are formatted and transmitted, and what actions should be taken in response to various commands (see Knauft col. 7, lines 21-26).

As per claim 12, Alleshouse in view of Salter in view of Berkeman discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 11, [see rejection to claim 11 above] but Alleshouse, Salter and Berkeman fail to disclose expressly wherein the characteristics of the printer are conveyed by a header of an HTTP hypertext transfer protocol.

However, Knauft discloses wherein the characteristics of the printer are conveyed by a header of an HTTP hypertext transfer protocol (see col. 7, lines 33-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Alleshouse, Salter, and Berkeman by combining the information regarding capabilities of a printer device with the HTTP header as taught by Knauft because it would provide for the purpose of defining how messages are formatted and transmitted, and what actions should be taken in response to various commands (see Knauft col. 7, lines 21-26).

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alleshouse (US 6,540,142) (hereinafter Alleshouse) in view of Salter et al. (US 7,496,838) (hereinafter Salter) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Garcia (US 2003/0048470) (hereinafter Garcia).

As per claim 8, Alleshouse and Salter discloses the method of managing a peripheral as claimed in claim 1, [see rejection to claim 1 above] but Alleshouse and Salter fail to disclose expressly wherein the interpretation software is a web browser.

However, Garcia discloses wherein the interpretation software is a web browser (see ¶6, ¶14, ¶17)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Alleshouse and Salter by combining the printing system with the browser as taught by Garcia because it would provide for the purpose of having control of printing documents at the printer itself rather than at a computer workstation (see Garcia ¶17).

10. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alleshouse (US 6,540,142) (hereinafter Alleshouse) in view of Salter et al. (US 7,496,838) (hereinafter Salter) as applied to claim10 above, and further in view of Wright et al ("XHTML-Print: Printer Working Group Draft", published May 23, 2002 by Don Wright, Melinda Grant, Peter Zehler, and Jun Fujisawa) (hereinafter Wright).

As per claim 13, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 10, [see rejection to claim 10 above] but Alleshouse and Salter fail to disclose expressly wherein the addressing of the data description file is a URI address.

However, Wright discloses wherein the addressing of the data description file is a URI address (e.g., "Style Sheet Module", see pages 20-22, "C.1. XHTML-Print 1.0 DTD".).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Alleshouse and Salter by combining the name and location of the stylesheet with the URIs as taught by Wright because it would provide for the purpose of informing the printer of the size of images before retrieving the image data itself to create portions of the page layout to accomodate the images (see Wright page 11, "4.1 Recommended Attributes on the 'img' and 'object' Elements", ¶1-2).

As per claim 14, Alleshouse in view of Salter discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 10, [see rejection to claim 10 above] wherein the content description language is the eXtended HyperText Markup Language (e.g. "XML input data stream", see Alleshouse col. 6, lines 2-24, 30-34) but Alleshouse and Salter fail to disclose expressly the presentation description file is written in the Cascading Style Sheet language.

However, Wright discloses the presentation description file is written in the Cascading Style Sheet language (see page 3, "1.1. XHTML for Printing", ¶1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Alleshouse and Salter by combining the XML input data stream with the CSS as taught by Wright because it would provide for the purpose of supporting printing environments where it is not feasible or desirable to install a printer-specific driver and where some variability in the formatting of the output is acceptable (see Wright page 3, "1.1. XHTML for Printing", ¶1).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, and 4-14 submitted on 6/30/2010 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shih-Wei Kraft whose telephone number is (571) 270-3388. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough, can be reached at the following telephone number: (571) 272-6799.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/S. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Hyung S. SOUGH/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2194
09/17/10